Support for the amendment and new claims

The amendments to claim 1 are supported throughout the application and in the priority documents. Support in the present application, for example, can be found at page 7 lines 19-20 and Example 4. New claims 14-17 are supported, for example, in the previously pending claims. New claims 12 and 13 are supported, for example, on page 35 line 22 to page 36 line 11, and thus these new claims do not constitute new matter.

Remarks

1. Priority

The patent office asserted that the presently pending claims were not entitled to the claimed priority date. The Applicants traverse this assertion with respect to the amended claims. The provisional priority document (60/175,005 filed January 7, 2000) clearly provides support for the presently claimed subject matter, as, for example, in section 3.3. Thus, the Applicants respectfully request that the patent office reconsider and withdraw the denial of the claimed priority dates.

2. Rejections under 35 USC 112, first paragraph

a. The patent office rejected claims 1-3 and 7-11 as not fulfilling the written description requirement of 35 USC Section 112. The Applicants traverse this rejection.

Claims 2-3 and 7-11 have been canceled, thus obviating their rejection. Claim 1 has been amended, and now recites methods for inhibiting cell migration, which the patent office has acknowledged as being adequately described by the specification (see office action of Feb. 6, 2003, page 4, third paragraph). Thus, the Applicants respectfully request that the patent office reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

b. The patent office rejected claims 1-3 and 7-11 as not fulfilling the enablement requirement of 35 USC Section 112. The Applicants traverse this rejection.

Claims 2-3 and 7-11 have been canceled, thus obviating their rejection. Claim 1 has been amended, and now recites methods for inhibiting cell migration, which is enabled by the specification (see, for example, Example 4). Thus, the Applicants respectfully request that the

patent office reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

CONCLUSIONS

Based upon the above arguments, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are ready for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone or personal interview would expedite prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (312) 913-2106.

Date:

5/29/03

Respectfully submitted, McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff

David Harper

Registration No. 42,636